# BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES, RECYCLING & RECOVERY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

# IN THE MATTER OF REVOCATION OF A PROBATIONARY CERTIFICATION:

Pinos Recycling – Maria de Lourdes Aguilar Address: 6919 Stockton Boulevard, Sacramento Ca Type of Entity: Revocation of Probationary Certificate File No.: IH14-002-BCR Certificate No.: RC142366.001 PRECEDENTIAL DECISION No.: 23-04

# Designation of decision as precedential under Government Code Section 11425.60

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11425.60, the Department of Resources, Recycling and Recovery hereby designates as precedential its decision, dated April 8, 2014, in the above-referenced action.

This decision is designated precedential effective September 10, 2023,

Sacramento, California.

Dated: September 10, 2023.

As approved by Rachel Machi Wagoner on September 10, 2023,

Department of Resources, Recycling & Recovery.

#### STATE OF CALIFORNIA BY: DM DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES RECYCLING AND RECOVERY

In the Matter of the Revocation of a Probationary Certification:

Case No. IH14-002-BCR

DECISION AND ORDER

E-filed

CalRecycle Legal Office Date: 4/8/14

PINOS RECYCLING RC142366.001

and

Maria de Lourdes Aguilar, as owner and individually

#### RESPONDENTS.

#### I. Background

The Division of Recycling ("Division") within the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery ("CalRecycle") issued a notice to Respondents on January 17, 2014 revoking probationary certificate RC142366.001 to operate a recycling center at 6919 Stockton Boulevard in Sacramento, California, citing to Public Resources Code ("PRC") Sections 14541(b) and 14591.2(d).

Respondents filed a timely appeal of the revocation pursuant to Title 14, Section 2130 of the California Code of Regulations ("CCR").

By notice served on all parties on February 20, 2014, this matter was scheduled for a live informal hearing to take place on March 7, 2014.

On February 21, 2014, the Division filed a motion to determine this matter by written argument instead. Following briefing by all parties, I granted the Division's motion and issued an order setting a briefing schedule on March 5, 2014.

Both parties submitted written briefs and the hearing record was closed as of March 28, 2014.

#### II. Issue

Should the Division's revocation of probationary certificate RC142366.001 based on PRC Sections 14541(b) and 14591.2(d) be sustained or reversed?

#### III. Preliminary Matters

The Division has requested that I take official notice of its official records in this matter concerning prior adjudication, legal filings, certification applications, and documents attached as exhibits. Setting aside potential issues of uncertainty as to the

exact scope of this request, I do not find it necessary to take official notice when true and correct copies of what was described by the Division as the full administrative record supporting the revocation were submitted to me under sworn declaration. Moreover, Respondents did not object to or challenge the admissibility or accuracy of the administrative record as lodged by the Division. I am therefore denying this request.

## IV. Findings of Fact

Maria de Lourdes Aguilar is the owner of a recycling center that was operating under probationary certificate number RC142366.001 as Pinos Recycling. Ms. Aguilar is also the owner of five other recycling center locations that were operating under non-probationary certificate numbers RC12870, RC12871, RC12873, RC12943, and RC12974 as Pinos Recycling. The record indicates that all of the aforementioned certificates share the same owner name, the same business name, and the same phone number for all locations. Respondents do not dispute identical ownership and indeed admit as much in their original hearing request.<sup>1</sup>

The five non-probationary certificates were revoked effective December 17, 2013 as part of a final agency decision following a formal administrative hearing before an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") with the Office of Administrative Hearings ("OAH"). The decision included a findings that Pinos Recycling had falsified consumer transaction log sheets and submitted fraudulent recycling claims to the Division. During the hearing, Ms. Aguilar admitted to "inventing" non-existent consumer transactions on the log sheets to support California Redemption Value ("CRV") payment claims. The ALJ thus found sufficient cause to revoke all five certificates under PRC Section 14591.2.

The Division subsequently revoked probationary certificate RC142366.001. The Division stated that PRC Section 14591.2(d) provided a legal basis to revoke Respondents' probationary certificate under PRC Section 14541(b) based on the findings and conclusions in the final agency decision following the OAH hearing.

### V. Analysis and Order

According to PRC Section 14541(b):

"A probationary certificate issued pursuant to this section shall be issued for a limited period of not more than two years. Before the end of the probationary period, the department shall issue a nonprobationary certificate, extend the probationary period for not more than one year, or, after notice to the probationary certificate holder, *revoke the probationary certificate.*" [emphasis added]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "...the department has previously made its finding based upon the conduct alleged relating to all other recycling centers owned by my client's..." [sic] E-mail from John Gugliotta to Kris Chisholm dated January 26, 2014.

PRC Section 14591.2 states in relevant part:

(b) All of the following are grounds for disciplinary action, in the form determined by the department in accordance with subdivision (c):

(2) The responsible party engaged in dishonesty, incompetence, negligence, or *fraud* in performing the functions and duties of a certificate holder or registrant.

(c) The department may take disciplinary action pursuant to this section, by taking any one of, or any combination of, the following:

(1) *Immediate revocation* of the certificate or registration, or revocation of a certificate or registration as of a specific date in the future.

(d) The department may do any of the following in taking disciplinary action pursuant to this section:

(1) If a certificate holder or registrant holds certificates or is registered to operate at more than one site or to operate in more than one capacity at one location, such as an entity certified as both a processor and a recycling center, the department may simultaneously revoke, suspend, or impose conditions upon some, or all of, the certificates held by the responsible party.

(2) If the responsible party is an officer, director, partner manager, employee, or the owner of a controlling ownership interest of another certificate holder or registrant, *that other operator's certificate or registration may also be revoked*, suspended, or conditioned by the department in the same proceeding, if the other certificate holder or registrant is given notice of that proceeding, *or in a subsequent proceeding*." [emphasis added]

Together, these two sections empower CalRecycle to revoke a probationary certificate if a responsible party engages in fraud in performing the duties of a certificate holder. In such cases, CalRecycle is authorized to revoke any and all certificates under the control of a responsible party either simultaneously during the same proceeding or at a subsequent proceeding.

This hearing is narrow in scope and limited to whether the administrative record supports a determination that there was a prior adjudication finding that Respondents engaged in fraud. If so, there are statutory grounds to revoke probationary certificate RC142366.001 if the responsible party is the same as in the prior adjudication. The Division has the burden of proof in this hearing under Evidence Code Section 500.

 The Division has met its burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence. The record contains a final agency decision finding that Respondents engaged in fraud in performing the duties of a certificate holder. Furthermore, the record amply supports a finding that the certificate holders in the prior adjudication are the same as in the present proceeding. Respondents have produced no evidence to rebut either point.

Respondents make several legal arguments that lack merit. First, they contend that the Division has produced no evidence demonstrating fraudulent behavior at the operating location under the probationary certificate. This argument is irrelevant insofar as it disregards the pertinent statutory authority in this case. In enacting PRC Section 14591.2(d), the Legislature determined that there need only be proof of fraudulent behavior by a responsible party while performing the duties of a certificate holder and that such behavior need not occur at each and every location under their control to support a revocation at multiple sites. Essentially, the law treats all of the locations under the control of a responsible party as a single operation for purposes of revocation for fraud.

Respondents claim that because PRC Section 14591.2 states that CalRecycle "may" take disciplinary action that the hearing officer has discretion as to whether to revoke the probationary certificate. This argument suggests the hearing officer may stand in the shoes of Division staff and exercise *de novo* enforcement discretion as to whether to take disciplinary action at all. This reflects a misunderstanding of the role of hearing officer. My delegation of authority from the Director is limited to hearing and issuing decisions on the propriety of certification actions that have already been taken. Furthermore, under 14 CCR Section 2130(c)(3), my function is restricted to determining whether the existing disciplinary action of Division staff should be "sustained" or "reversed" based on the evidence in the record. If a preponderance of the evidence supports the action, I must sustain. That is the case here.

Finally, Respondents allege that they have caused no loss to the Beverage Container Recycling Fund and that there is no risk in allowing the facility at issue to continue operating. As neither of these arguments addresses any element of the applicable statutory grounds for revocation, I find them irrelevant.

#### VI. Order

Based on the above factual and legal considerations, the revocation of probationary certificate RC142366.001 is hereby sustained.

It is so ordered.

**HEARING OFFICER** 

DATED: 4/8/2014

Harllee Branch, Senior Staff Counsel

Decision and Order Page 4 of 4



# DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES RECYCLING AND RECOVERY

LEGAL OFFICE

801 K STREET, MS 19-03, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 • (916) 327-0089 • WWW.CALRECYCLE.CA.GOV

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Donnet McFarlane, declare as follows:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My place of employment and business is as in the letterhead.

On <u>April 8, 2014</u>, I served <u>Decision and Order</u> in the Matter of Pinos Recycling, Case No.: IH14-002-BCR:

John Gugliotta, Esq. The Law Offices of Gugliotta & Ponzini 140 Huguenot Street, Second Floor New Rochelle, NY, 10801 gugliottalaw@optonline.net

Kris Chisholm Staff Counsel CalRecycle, Legal Office 801 K Street, MS 19-03 Sacramento, CA 95814 Kris.chisholm@calrecycle.ca.gov

by:

- X First Class Mail In a sealed envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, via United States Postal Service.
- Electronic Service Sent to the email addresses listed above.
- **FAX** Sent to fax numbers listed above.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed at <u>Sacramento</u>, California, on the <u>8th</u> day of <u>April, 2014</u>.

(Signature)

œ ORIGINAL PRINTED ON 100 % POST-CONSUMER CONTENT, PROCESSED CHLORINE FREE PAPER